

Louisiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table, as Revised to Reflect Data Submitted with the State's June 15, 2009 Appeal

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 17.1%. The FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 17.7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 19%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 29.9%. The FFY 2006 data were 28.97%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 23.0%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 56.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 54.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 73.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.4% for English language arts (ELA) and 99.3% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 99.35% for ELA and remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 99.3% for math.</p> <p>The State met the FFY 2007 targets of 97.75% for ELA and 98.7% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table, as Revised to Reflect Data Submitted with the State's June 15, 2009 Appeal

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
against alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]																																																																	
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>FFY 2006 Data</th><th>FFY 2007 Data</th><th>FFY 2007 Target</th><th>FFY 2006 Data</th><th>FFY 2007 Data</th><th>FFY 2007 Target</th></tr><tr><td></td><td colspan="3">Reading</td><td colspan="3">Math</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>39.13%</td><td>38.5%</td><td>57.9%</td><td>43.0%</td><td>41.3%</td><td>53.5%</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>33.84%</td><td>35.7%</td><td>57.9%</td><td>34.4%</td><td>41.1%</td><td>53.5%</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>26.70%</td><td>33.0%</td><td>57.9%</td><td>31.6%</td><td>40.4%</td><td>53.5%</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>28.07%</td><td>26.7%</td><td>57.9%</td><td>29.9%</td><td>30.5%</td><td>53.5%</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>23.34%</td><td>25.5%</td><td>57.9%</td><td>26.7%</td><td>25.8%</td><td>53.5%</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>19.66%</td><td>20.3%</td><td>57.9%</td><td>21.7%</td><td>24.3%</td><td>53.5%</td></tr><tr><td>HS</td><td>27.85%</td><td>20.1%</td><td>57.9%</td><td>31.3%</td><td>24.5%</td><td>53.5%</td></tr></table> <p>These data represent progress in part and slippage in part from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets.</p>	Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target		Reading			Math			3	39.13%	38.5%	57.9%	43.0%	41.3%	53.5%	4	33.84%	35.7%	57.9%	34.4%	41.1%	53.5%	5	26.70%	33.0%	57.9%	31.6%	40.4%	53.5%	6	28.07%	26.7%	57.9%	29.9%	30.5%	53.5%	7	23.34%	25.5%	57.9%	26.7%	25.8%	53.5%	8	19.66%	20.3%	57.9%	21.7%	24.3%	53.5%	HS	27.85%	20.1%	57.9%	31.3%	24.5%	53.5%	OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
Grade	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	39.13%	38.5%	57.9%	43.0%	41.3%	53.5%																																																											
4	33.84%	35.7%	57.9%	34.4%	41.1%	53.5%																																																											
5	26.70%	33.0%	57.9%	31.6%	40.4%	53.5%																																																											
6	28.07%	26.7%	57.9%	29.9%	30.5%	53.5%																																																											
7	23.34%	25.5%	57.9%	26.7%	25.8%	53.5%																																																											
8	19.66%	20.3%	57.9%	21.7%	24.3%	53.5%																																																											
HS	27.85%	20.1%	57.9%	31.3%	24.5%	53.5%																																																											
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and [Results Indicator]	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 18.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 29.2%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 19.0%.</p> <p>OSEP’s June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required that the State, in its FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State also must describe the results of the State’s examination of data from FFY 2007. In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of</p>																																																															

Louisiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table, as Revised to Reflect Data Submitted with the State's June 15, 2009 Appeal

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps															
	2005 and FFY 2006. The State also was instructed to clarify that the review, and if appropriate, revision of policies, practices and procedures, are conducted on an annual basis for all districts identified for that year with significant discrepancies. In the FFY 2007 APR as revised in the State’s June 15, 2009 appeal, the State reported the actions implemented to review the policies, practices and procedures of all significantly discrepant LEAs identified during FFY 2005, FFY 2006, and FFY 2007, reported the results of the review, and clarified that the reviews are conducted on an annual basis for all districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFYs 2005 and 2006 as well as 2007.	IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).															
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. [Results Indicator]	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.															
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>FFY 2006 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Data</td><td>FFY 2007 Target</td><td>Progress</td></tr><tr><td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td><td>57.99</td><td>60.39</td><td>60.22</td><td>2.40%</td></tr><tr><td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td><td>16.71</td><td>14.85</td><td>14.53</td><td>1.86%</td></tr></table>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	57.99	60.39	60.22	2.40%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	16.71	14.85	14.53	1.86%	OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress													
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	57.99	60.39	60.22	2.40%													
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	16.71	14.85	14.53	1.86%													

Louisiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table, as Revised to Reflect Data Submitted with the State's June 15, 2009 Appeal

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	1.9	1.74	2.17	0.16%																					
	These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data. The State met its FFY 2007 targets for 5A and 5C, and did not meet its target for 5B.																									
6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). [Results Indicator]	States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.					The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.																				
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	<div>The State’s FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</div> <table><tr><th>07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th><th>Social Emotional</th><th>Knowledge & Skills</th><th>Appropriate Behavior</th></tr><tr><td>a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td><td>16</td><td>8</td><td>8</td></tr><tr><td>c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td><td>4</td><td>2</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable</td><td>13</td><td>13</td><td>14</td></tr></table>					07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	4	1	1	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	16	8	8	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	4	2	2	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable	13	13	14	The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010. The State must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	4	1	1																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	16	8	8																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	4	2	2																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable	13	13	14																							

Louisiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table, as Revised to Reflect Data Submitted with the State's June 15, 2009 Appeal

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	to same-aged peers.				
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	63	76	74	
	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00	100.00	99.00%	
		%	%		
	The State did not provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. The State explained that historically the contractor that collects data for this indicator has provided only percentages to the State, but will change the reporting system so that both the number and percentage of children will be reported for the 2009-2010 school year.				
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 31%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 38%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 41%.				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%. Based on the data submitted with its June 15, 2009 appeal, the State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%. However, it is not clear from the APR whether, as required by the measurement for this indicator, the State determined whether LEAs had disproportionate representation based on an analysis of child count data for all students in special education, or, rather included a second step in which some LEAs were determined not to have disproportionate representation based on analysis of data for children who received an initial evaluation during FFY 2007. The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator. In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must demonstrate that it is making its determinations about whether LEAs have disproportionate representation based on its analysis of the child count data for all children in special education, rather than an analysis of data on children who received initial evaluations.

Louisiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table, as Revised to Reflect Data Submitted with the State's June 15, 2009 Appeal

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>Based on the data submitted with its June 15, 2009 appeal, the State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%. However, it is not clear from the APR whether, as required by the measurement for this indicator, the State determined whether LEAs had disproportionate representation based on an analysis of child count data for all students in special education, or rather, included a second step in which some LEAs were determined not to have disproportionate representation based on an analysis of data for children who received an initial evaluation during FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>In the APR due February 1, 2010, the State must demonstrate that it is making its determinations about whether LEAs have disproportionate representation based on its analysis of the child count data for all children in special education, rather than an analysis of data on children who received initial evaluations.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline).</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.86%. The FFY 2006 data were 100%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table, as Revised to Reflect Data Submitted with the State's June 15, 2009 Appeal

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95.41%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 90.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator was not corrected in a timely manner. The State reported that the LEA is on a course of action to correct the noncompliance through hired personnel and technical assistance.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, that the uncorrected FFY 2005 noncompliance related to this indicator was corrected. The State reported that one of the two findings of noncompliance was subsequently corrected, and the other finding remains uncorrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. In addition, the State must demonstrate that the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 and the one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 regarding the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) were corrected.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table, as Revised to Reflect Data Submitted with the State's June 15, 2009 Appeal

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>In reporting on correction, the State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that the LEA with remaining noncompliance from FFY 2006 and each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP), although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 66%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 76%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all seven of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table, as Revised to Reflect Data Submitted with the State's June 15, 2009 Appeal

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>transition content for each youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 81%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 38.82%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 40%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2007 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 71%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 92.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 55 of 78 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it requires Corrective Action Plans that are specifically designed to meet the unique compliance needs of the districts, on-site follow-up visits where there is continuing noncompliance, and a three-year improvement effort to make needed changes in a system to address discipline.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009 that the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005 was corrected. The State reported that the remaining uncorrected noncompliance identified in</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, that the State has corrected the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2007 APR.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table, as Revised to Reflect Data Submitted with the State's June 15, 2009 Appeal

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>FFY 2005 was subsequently corrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFYs 2005 and 2006 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2007 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 77%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one due process hearing. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Louisiana Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table, as Revised to Reflect Data Submitted with the State's June 15, 2009 Appeal

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 63%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 75%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 75%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 87%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 77%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 82%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 98.84%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 93%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 of 95.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>